



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,411	12/07/2000	Samy Ashkar	CMZ-124CP	1508

23579 7590 08/10/2004

PATREA L. PABST
PABST PATENT GROUP LLP
400 COLONY SQUARE
SUITE 1200
ATLANTA, GA 30361

EXAMINER

HADDAD, MAHER M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/732,411	ASHKAR, SAMY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maheer M. Haddad	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,7 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7, and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1644

RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT

1. Applicant's amendment, filed 7/8/04, is acknowledged.
2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 16-18 are pending and under examination as they read on a method of inhibiting/decreasing adhesion of a target cell to a substrate comprising providing the target cell with the adhesion modulatory peptidic associated substrate of SEQ ID NO:15 (inhibits VLA-4/VCAM interaction) such that adhesion of the target cell to the substrate is inhibited wherein the target cell is endothelial cells, neutrophil and macrophage and wherein the substrate is titanium, a polyvinyl surface, a gel, collagen, hyaluronic acid and PGA.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention essentially for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action mailed 01/08/04. This is a New Matter rejection.

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/08/04, have been fully considered, but have not been found convincing.

The phrase "less than about 2500 Daltons" claimed in claim 1, represents a departure from the specification and the claims as originally filed.

Applicant's amendment filed 7/08/04 points to the specification at page 6, line 15 for support for the newly added limitations "less than about 2500 Daltons" as claimed in claim 1. However, the specification does not provide a clear support of "less than about 2500 Daltons". It is noted that the specification on page 6, lines 15, discloses that the adhesion-modulatory peptides can be between 100 and 2500 Da, while Applicant broaden the claims to read on any Da that is less than 2500 such as 50, 75, or 99 Da. Further term "about" would read on 2501, 2510, 2550 Da or more. The instant claims now recite a limitation which was not clearly disclosed in the specification and recited in the claims as originally filed.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of inhibiting binding of VCAM-1 containing cell to $\alpha 4\beta 1$ integrin containing cell *in vitro*, with the adhesion peptide SEQ ID NO: 15, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for inhibiting binding of any cell to any integrin or glycosaminoglycan or vascular adhesion molecule, comprising providing the cell with a peptide, wherein the peptide has a molecular weight less than about 2500 Daltons and consisting of a sequence of SEQ ID NOs: 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, or 15 in claim 1, wherein the cell is within a "subject" in claim 17. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it

Art Unit: 1644

pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and or use the invention commensurate in scope with this claim for the same reasons set forth in the previous Office Action mailed 01/08/04.

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/08/04, have been fully considered, but have not been found persuasive.

Applicant submits that claim 17, previously directed to inhibiting the binding of a cell within a human subject, has been canceled. Applicant submits that the by canceling claim 17, the previous rejection is moot.

However, claim 17 is still pending. Therefore, the rejection is maintained. Furthermore, the Examiner wishes to point out that claim 1 also reads on in vivo method in the absence of clear recitation that the method is for in vitro use.

6. No claim is allowed.

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maher Haddad whose telephone number is (571) 272-0845. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (571) 272-0841. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maher Haddad, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

August 9, 2004


CHRISTINA CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600